Cumulative Table of Cases Connecticut Appellate Reports Volume 200

Borg v. Cloutier	82
Private nuisance; invasion of privacy; defamation; defamation per se; trespass; punitive damages; permanent injunction; motion for contempt; claim that trial	
court abused its discretion in failing to set aside jury's verdict; whether trial	
$court {\it failed}\ to\ inquire\ a dequately\ into\ possible\ juror\ misconduct;\ claim\ that\ trial$	
court improperly awarded punitive damages to defendant; whether trial court	
correctly determined that permanent injunction was warranted; claim that trial	
court improperly held named plaintiff in contempt for failing to comply with	
its permanent injunction order.	
Budrawich v . Budrawich	229
Dissolution of marriage; whether trial court properly found that defendant consented to court's request for extension of 120 day time period pursuant to rule of practice (§ 11-19) to issue decision on plaintiff's motion for order; whether trial court	
properly granted plaintiff's motion to modify alimony; whether trial court prop-	
erly found that plaintiff met her burden to establish substantial change in circum- stances; claim that trial court improperly granted plaintiff's motion to correct	
and issued corrected memorandum of decision; clarity of court's construction of alimony provision in dissolution judgment; whether language of alimony	
provision relieved plaintiff of burden to demonstrate substantial change in cir-	
cumstances; mootness; claim that trial court improperly granted defendant's motion for downward modification of alimony.	
	205
Clinton v. Aspinwall	205
verdict; whether trial court improperly construed agreement and erred in denying	
posttrial motions; whether trial court improperly instructed jury regarding provi-	
sion of agreement; harmless error; whether trial court improperly awarded attor-	
ney's fees and costs.	
Davis v. Davis	180
Dissolution of marriage; whether trial court provided defendant with adequate notice	100
that it might dispose of plaintiff's motion for modification of alimony at certain	
hearing; claim that trial court improperly ordered reimbursement to plaintiff	
for expenses related to fixing septic system at marital residence; claim that trial	
court abused its discretion by failing to consider plaintiff's conduct relative to	
defendant's efforts to make repairs himself; unpreserved claim that trial court	
failed to apply unclean hands doctrine; whether trial court failed to apply statute	
(§ 46b-224) governing suspension of child support order in calculating child	
support arrearage; claim that trial court improperly refused to deduct from	
arrearage amount for period of time parties' minor child was in defendant's	
custody.	
Ferri v. Powell-Ferri.	63
Vexatious litigation; trusts; cross complaint; motion for summary judgment; whether	
trial court erred in determining that defendants had probable cause to bring	
cross complaint; whether trial court applied correct standard for determining	
whether defendants had probable cause to prosecute cross complaint; whether trial	
court properly determined that meritless action did not necessitate conclusion	
that it lacked probable cause or was frivolous; whether trial court correctly deter-	
mined that lack of precedent in other jurisdictions did not render cross complaint	
as being without probable cause.	
Giordano v. Giordano	
	130
Dissolution of marriage; motion to modify alimony; motion for contempt; claim	130
that trial court erred in interpreting separation agreement to include defendant's	130
that trial court erred in interpreting separation agreement to include defendant's supplemental pension as basis for modification of alimony; claim that agreement	130
that trial court erred in interpreting separation agreement to include defendant's	130

agreement as distributing supplemental pension to defendant at time of dissolu- tion; whether trial court abused its discretion in modifying alimony award; whether trial court improperly granted plaintiff's motion for contempt.	
Hill v. OSJ of Bloomfield, LLC	149
HSBC Bank USA, National Assn. v. Gilbert	335
In re Elizabeth W. (Memorandum Decision)	901
Maldonado v. Flannery Negligence; personal injury; damages; motion for additur; claim that trial court abused its discretion in granting plaintiffs' joint motion for additurs; failure of trial court to identify part of trial record that supported its conclusion that jury's failure to award noneconomic damages was unreasonable; whether jury reasonably could have determined that plaintiffs failed to prove any noneconomic damages for pain and suffering.	1
McLoughlin v. Planning & Zoning Commission	307
Pentland v. Commissioner of Correction	296
Ruscoe v . Commissioner of Correction (Memorandum Decision)	901
Sosa v. Robinson	264
State v. Curet	13
Possession of narcotics with intent to sell; motion to suppress; whether trial court properly denied defendant's motion to suppress; whether trial court properly concluded that search was lawful under exigent circumstances exception to warrant requirement; whether trial court properly concluded that search was justified under emergency doctrine.	

State v. Syms	55
Motion to correct illegal sentence; robbery in first degree; conspiracy to commit robbery in first degree; unpreserved claim that trial court violated defendant's rights to due process when it accepted his guilty pleas without advising him that sentence could run consecutively to unrelated sentence he was then serving; claim that combination of sentence of incarceration followed by special parole violated federal prohibition against double jeopardy.	
Stilkey v. Zembko	165
Statutory theft; whether trial court abused its discretion in applying continuing course of conduct doctrine; whether trial court was within its discretion to deter-	100
mine that no party was prejudiced by lapse in pleading specific statute of limita- tions or continuing course of conduct doctrine; claim that trial court improperly	
$concluded\ that\ continuing\ course\ of\ conduct\ doctrine\ tolled\ statute\ of\ limitations;$	
claim that trial court's findings that plaintiff had no knowledge of defendant's	
actions and had not consented to or authorized them were clearly erroneous	